

REMARKS

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the above referenced patent application in view of the amendments and remarks set forth herein, and respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw all rejections. Claims 12, 16, 22 and 26 have been amended. Claims 15 and 25 have been canceled without prejudice. No claims have been added. Thus, claims 12-14, 16-20, 22-24 and 26-30 are pending.

35 U.S.C. §103(a) Rejections

35 U.S.C. §103(a) Rejection over *Owens* in view of *Sadhwani-Tully*, *Griffin* and *Bahrs*

The Office Action rejects claims 12-20 and 22-30 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious in light of *Owens et al.*, USPN 6,315,572 (hereinafter “*Owens*”) in view of *Sadhwani-Tully*, USPN 6,785,822 (hereinafter “*Sadhwani-Tully*”) in further view of *Griffin et al.*, USPN 6,917,975 (hereinafter “*Griffin*”) and in further view of *Bahrs et al.*, USPN 6,862,686 (hereinafter “*Bahrs*”). For at least the following reasons, Applicants traverse the above rejection.

Current independent claims 12 and 22 variously recite (emphasis added):

'...storing **a different respective set of allocation data for each function** in a set of functions of an authoring tool, **each set of allocation data including a different respective allocation setting for each** of an instructional design role and a content definition role for a user to assume with respect to the authoring tool, **each allocation setting specifying a respective ability to customize an allocation** of the function to the particular role;...

generating, based on the allocation settings of the sets of allocation data, **a list of one or more functions** in the set of functions **available to be selected for allocation**...and presenting to the user the list of one or more functions in the set of functions;...'

The claim amendments are supported in the original disclosure at least by FIGS. 9 and 10 and by paragraphs [0044]-[0046] of the specification. As demonstrated in the following discussion, no combination of *Owens*, *Sadhwani-Tully*, *Griffin* and *Bahrs* teaches or suggests presenting a list of functions available to be selected for allocation, the list generated based on **different respective sets of allocation data for each function** in a set of functions of an authoring tool, each set of allocation data including **a different**

respective allocation setting for each of an instructional design role and a content definition role for a user to assume with respect to the authoring tool, each allocation setting **specifying a respective ability to customize an allocation** of the function to the particular role.

The Office Action relies upon FIG. 4 of *Sadhwani-Tully* as allegedly disclosing presenting functions in a list for allocation to roles. The relied-upon portions of *Sadhwani-Tully* relate to a profile editor used for assigning an action group list 418 to various profiles of a profile list 414. See, e.g. *Sadhwani-Tully* col. 5, line 60 to col. 6, line 10. However, regardless of what the state of assignment of particular action groups to particular profiles may be at any given time, *Sadhwani-Tully* fails to disclose that action groups have anything other than **the same ability to be assigned** (or unassigned) to profiles. In other words, a system administrator using the profile editor in *Sadhwani-Tully* has the same ability to change profile assignments for the various action groups, and therefore *Sadhwani-Tully* fails to disclose that action groups have different abilities to have their profile assignments changed. By way of illustration, *Sadhwani-Tully* fails to disclose that one particular action group is assignable to one profile, but is not assignable to another profile. Similarly, *Sadhwani-Tully* fails to disclose that that one particular profile may be assigned one particular action group, but may not be assigned another particular action group.

By contrast, each of current independent claims 12 and 22 variously recite presenting a list generated based on a set of allocation data of a function, the set of allocation data including **a different respective allocation setting for each of an instructional design role and a content definition role** for a user to assume with respect to the authoring tool, **each allocation setting specifying a different respective ability to customize an allocation** of the function to the particular role. Applicants' variously claimed allocation settings allow the user configurability of an authoring tool to be defined to a higher resolution, e.g. specifying limited selectability of a particular function for allocation to only certain roles that the user may assume. The Office Action does not offer *Owens*, *Griffin* or *Bahrs* as teaching or suggesting this type of role-specific allocatability for functions, and Applicants respectfully submit that it is not taught or

suggested by any combination of the references. Therefore, *Owens, Sadhwani-Tully, Griffin* and *Bahrs* fail to teach or suggest at least one limitation of the invention as variously recited in each of independent claims 12 and 22 – e.g. a respective set of allocation data for each function in a set of functions of an authoring tool, each set of allocation data including a respective allocation setting for each of an instructional design role and a content definition role for a user to assume with respect to the authoring tool, each allocation setting specifying a respective ability to customize an allocation of the function to the particular role.

Accordingly, each of current independent claims 12 and 22 is non-obvious in light of *Owens, Sadhwani-Tully, Griffin* and *Bahrs*, as are any claims depending therefrom. For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicants request that the above 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejection of claims 12-20 and 22-30 based on *Owens, Sadhwani-Tully, Griffin* and *Bahrs* be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicants submit that the objections and rejections have been overcome. Therefore, claims 12-14, 16-20, 22-24 and 26-30 are in condition for allowance and such action is earnestly solicited. The Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned by telephone if such contact would further the examination of the present application. Please charge any shortages and credit any overcharges to our Deposit Account number 02-2666.

Respectfully submitted,
BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN, LLP

Date: January 28, 2009

/Dermot G. Miller/
Dermot G. Miller
Attorney for Applicants
Reg. No. 58,309

1279 Oakmead Parkway
Sunnyvale, CA 94085-4040
(503) 439-8778